







UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--|
| 09/493,903 | 01/28/2000 | Jay McCormack | 00034 | 2805 | |
| 75 | 90 04/14/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| | Edward L Pencoske Esquire | | | SANTIAGO, ENRIQUE L | |
| Thorp Reed & Armstrong One Oxford Centre | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| 301 Grant Street | | | 2671 | 14 | |
| Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1425 | | | DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | T A |
|---|--|---|
| • | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| , Advisory Action | 09/493,903 | MCCORMACK ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Enrique L Santiago | 2671 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence address |
| THE REPLY FILED 25 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment whic | ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in |
| PERIOD FOR RE | EPLY [check either a) or b)] | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TI date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amonths. | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension |
| fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | ce later than three months after the main certain the certai | lling date of the final rejection, even if |
| A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFf | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | pelow); | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or | n better form for appeal by mate | erially reducing or simplifying the |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceliNOTE: . | ing a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claims. |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | tion(s): | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | eparate, timely filed amendment |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: | | idered but does NOT place the |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | • |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>20,25 and 27-29</u> . | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: 9,17,18,31,37 and 40. | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8,12,14-16,19,24,30,32-36,38,39</u> | <u>9 and 41</u> . | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | roved or b) disapproved by t | the Examiner. |
| 9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement | | |
| 10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> | Ma | non the transfer was we |
| | SL": | SECTION OF A CARL THE COURT OF |
| S. Patent and Trademark Office | | |

Continuation of 10. Other: The amended claims would be rejected for the same reasons stated in the final rejection. The added limitation "searching a second shape for said subshapes" was addressed in the rejection of claim 30. Therefore the combination of the ammended claims would be combined with the rejection of claim 30. Regarding the applicants arguments concerning figure 4, this was addressed in the interview summary wich is attached and states that the applicability of fig. 4 of Usami et al. to claim 1. The Examiner stated that claim 1 is broad and that Usami et al. does teach "a group of sbshapes arranged in a hierarchical order" (see figs. 4 and 12, column 5, lines 19-30). Regarding the applicants argument that "Trew...does not teach the method of searching a second shape for a transformation of a subshape", Trew does teach said limitation (see column 10, lines 24-50)...